

REMARKS

Claims 2-3 and 5-11 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 6 and 8-11 are allowed. Applicants cancel claim 4 by way of this Amendment. Claims 2-5 and 7 presently stand rejected.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (5,774,884) in view of newly cited Herding et al. (5,547,481).

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (5,774,884) in view of newly cited Herding et al. (5,547,481) as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Dauber et al. (5,916,671).

Analysis

Of the rejected claims, only claim 3 is in independent form; therefore, the following discussion is initially directed to this independent claim.

Claim 3 is directed to a laminate for forming an enclosed space to hold an adsorbent. The laminate includes ultra high molecular weight polyolefin porous (UHPE) film and polytetrafluorethylene porous (PTFE) film. The UHPE film has particles linked together, forming pores between the particles.

Tanaka discloses a PTFE film laminated to a porous reinforcing material. Tanaka fails to teach or suggest that the PTFE film should be laminated to UHPE film, or a film made of particles having pores formed therein.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/487,239

Herding discloses a filter element which includes UHPE film made of particles having pores formed therein.

Neither of the cited references is directed to a laminate that forms an enclosed space. Instead, the laminates are used for filters that are one-dimensional.

Claim 3 recites that the UHPE film is adhered to the side of the PTFE film facing the interior of the enclosed space. The combination of cited references do not teach or suggest this feature. Neither of the cited references is directed to a laminate for forming an enclosed space, and thus, there is no suggestion that the UHPE film should be adhered to the PTFE film as recited.

Thus, the combination of cited references would not render claim 3 obvious.

The remaining rejections are directed to the dependent claims. These claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 3, by virtue of their dependency therefrom.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/487,239

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Ellen R. Smith
Registration No. 43,042

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Date: October 7, 2002

Attorney Docket No.: Q57646

APPENDIX

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claim 4 is canceled.

The claims are amended as follows:

3. (Twice Amended) A laminate for forming [a] an enclosed space to hold an adsorbent, which comprises an ultra high molecular weight polyolefin porous film and a polytetrafluorethylene porous film,

wherein said ultra high molecular weight polyolefin porous film has a structure in which ultra high molecular weight polyolefin particles are linked together, forming pores among them,

wherein said ultra high molecular weight polyolefin porous film is adhered to a side of said polytetrafluorethylene porous film which faces an interior of the enclosed space.

5. (Twice Amended) A container holding an adsorbent, said container being made of a laminate according to any one of claims 2 to [4] 3, and holding the adsorbent.